



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/955,693	09/18/2001	Jun Cao	019717-002700US	9756
23363	7590	11/28/2005	EXAMINER	
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP			WONG, LINDA	
PO BOX 7068			ART UNIT	
PASADENA, CA 91109-7068			PAPER NUMBER	
			2634	

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Handwritten initials

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	<p>Application No. 09/955,693</p>	<p>Applicant(s) CAO, JUN</p>	
	<p>Examiner Linda Wong</p>	<p>Art Unit 2634</p>	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 29 August 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: 5, 6, 12, 14, 15 and 19-23.
- Claim(s) objected to: _____.
- Claim(s) rejected: 1-4, 7-11, 13 and 16-18.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet.

ATTACHMENT: INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claims 1,7, and 13, The applicant argues that a D-type flip-flop shown in Hogge's invention is not the equivalent to a latch. The physical circuitry of a latch can be shown to be different from the physical circuitry of a D-type flip flop. Based on the applicant's recited limitations, the physical circuitry of the latch is not recited. The claims recite the functionality of the latch as "providing a second signal by passing the first signal when the clock signal is at the first level, and storing the first signal when the clock signal is at the second level, wherein the second signal is provided by a latch". As explained the final rejection mailed June 28, 2005, although Hogge does not explicitly state that the second signal is produced by a latch, based on Spangoletti et al's invention, it can be shown that the second signal, outputted by a D-type flip flop as explicitly specified by Hogge, acts as a latch as defined in the limitations recited in the claims. Please refer to the final rejection as disclosed in the office action mailed June 28, 2005 for further explanation as to why, based on the limitation recited defining the functionality of the latch recited, disclosed by Hogge can be shown to act as a latch as described by Spangoletti et al.

In addition to the explanation disclosed in the previous Office Action, mailed June 28, 2005, Spangoletti explicitly states, in Fig. 4, label 203 and Col. 12, lines 1-5, a "latch receives, on input D203, the signal from output Q202 of D-type (202) ... ". Although Hogge explicitly states a D-type flip flop, the D-type flip flop shown in Fig. 4, labels 116, is identical to the logic gate shown in Fig. 4, label 203 of Spangoletti's invention. Since Spangoletti states that the shown logic gate is a latch, it is shown that Hogge's disclosed logic gate also acts as a latch. Furthermore, Spangoletti's invention is used to show that Hogge's disclosed D-type flip flop is identical to the latch shown in Spangoletti's invention, thus motivation is unnecessary.

Continuation of 13. Other: The applicant mailed a response to the final rejection sent 6/28/2005 within 2 months. The date, 8/28/2005, the 2 month deadline for the response to the final rejection, lands on a Sunday and the response to the final rejection was mailed 8/29/2005 is appropriate to the 2 month deadline.



STEPHEN CHIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800